

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 13, 14 and 20-34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 23, 24, 28 and 31 are amended, and claim 34 is added. Support for the amendments is found at, for example, Fig. 3. No new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims at least in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 13, 14, 20, 22-24 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0052614 (Howard) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0027422 (Sempel); claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Howard in view of Sempel and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,506 (Dawson); claims 21, 25, 26, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Howard in view of Sempel and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058195 (Adachi); and claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Howard in view of Sempel and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0171607 (Senda).

Regarding the rejections of claim 1, Howard and Sempel, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest an electronic circuit having "a length of a third period in which the conduction state of the first transistor set in accordance with the voltage signal being changeable," as recited in claim 1 of the present application. Howard only discloses that the gate voltage levels of a first transistor vary between the data voltage and the reverse data during each pixel refresh period (T). See paragraph [0023]. Fig. 2B and Fig. 3B of Howard clearly show that the data voltage period, or the reverse data period are constant and not changeable.

In contrast, in one embodiment of the present application, Fig. 3 clearly shows that a period within a subframe that is changeable. Specifically, the remainder of the light-emitting period TL_i in a subframe SF_i is changeable where $i = 1$ to 6. The applied references do not

suggest such a changeable period. Claim 6 recites similar features referred to in connection with claim 1. Thus, claims 1 and 6 are patentable over Howard in view of Sempel.

Regarding the rejection of claim 23, Howard and Sempel, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the feature of "a length of a third period in which no current flows through the first transistor is changeable," as recited in claim 23. As discussed above, Howard only discloses that the gate voltage levels of a first transistor vary between the data voltage and the reverse data during each pixel refresh period (T), but does not disclose a period that is changeable.

Claim 24 recites similar features as those referred to in connection with claim 23. Thus, claims 23 and 24 are patentable over Howard in view of Sempel.

Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20-22 and 25-34 directly or indirectly depend from claims 1, 6, 23 or 24. Thus, claims 2-5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20-22 and 25-34 are also patentable over Howard in view of Sempel for at least the same reason as claims 1, 6, 23 and 24, as well as for the additional features they recite.

For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Aaron L. Webb
Registration No. 56,930

JAO:ALW/amw

Date: December 18, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--